DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 135 532 RC 009 688

AUTHOR	Coombs, P. H.
TITLE	Education for Rural Development: Some Implications for Planning. IIEP Seminar Paper: 20.
INSTITUTION	United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, Paris (France). International Inst. for Educational Planning.
REPORT NO	IIEP-SP-20
PUB DATE	75
NOTE	30p.; Paper presented at the IIEP Seminar on "The Planning Problems in Rural Education" (October 13-17, 1975)
AVAILABLE FROM	International Institute for Educational Planning, 7-9 Rue Eugene Delacroix, 75016 Paris (France) ($0.60)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Change Strategies; Community Education; *Continuous Learning; Decentralization; *Educational Alternatives; *Educational Development; Educational Resources; *Interagency Coordination; Interagency Planning; Nonformal Education; *Planning; Political Influences; *Rural Development; Socioeconomic Influences; Voluntary Agencies

ABSTRACT

Rural development is a far more complex, long term proposition than has been generally admitted, for it involves a fundamental transformation across social, political, and economic lines. While the learning needs of rural populations vary considerably, educational planning for all rural areas should incorporate the concept of learning as a lifelong process, and the collective potential of existing formal, informal, and nonformal educational modes should be thoroughly explored. Possible means of affecting change via careful educational planning might include: (1) reorientation and transformation of the schools (area specific objectives to accomodate the majority, rather than the minority; flexible time schedules that do not tie age to grade; and concentration on a generalized curriculum); (2) building educational components into local development projects; (3) strengthening indigenous learning systems to do a broader and better job; (4) tying related educational programs together; and (5) tapping unused resources (e.g., broadcasting systems, underutilized school facilities and teachers, etc.). These suggestions imply that educational planning must: involve all voluntary and official organizations; become more and more decentralized; be melded with development planning; pay much closer attention to the sociological, cultural, political, and organizational aspects of education; include training for non-professional planners. (JC)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

Rec 10-01-77

ED135532

IIEP seminar paper: (20)

EDUCATION FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT: SOME IMPLICATIONS FOR PLANNING

P. H. Coombs

A contribution to the IIEP Seminar on "The planning problems in rural education"
13 - 17 October 1975

3 cc frames

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
John Hall for IIEP
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

RD009688

INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE
FOR EDUCATIONAL PLANNING
(established by Unesco)
7-9, rue Eugène-Delacroix, 75016 Paris

6074US

© Unesco 1975

The opinions expressed in these papers are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Institute or of Unesco.

CONTENTS

	Page
The meaning of rural development and education	4
The learning needs of rural populations	6
Existing means for serving rural learning needs	10
Promising possibilities for the future	15
Implications for educational planning	24

This paper examines some of the implications for educational planning suggested by the International Council for Educational Development's (ICED) recent studies of education for rural development.[1] Though the paper focuses on education in the poorest rural areas and poorest countries, much of what is said also applies to urban areas and to higher income countries.

The thrust of the argument is that educational planning as generally conceived and practiced over the past dozen years must be drastically reoriented to serve the emerging new strategies of integrated rural development that are now being widely advocated by international agencies and are beginning to be adopted by more and more developing countries.

For the most part, educational planning, along with the research and training activities associated with it, has concentrated on formal education systems, and especially on nationwide planning of centrally managed systems within the purview of ministries of education and "national education

---

[1]The ICED studies were sponsored by the World Bank and UNICEF and were contributed to by numerous developing countries and the United Nations and bilateral assistance agencies. The three main reports issued to date include: (1) New Paths to Learning for Rural Children and Youth; (2) Attacking Rural Poverty: How Nonformal Education Can Help; (3) Education for Development: Case Studies for Planners. A fourth publication, New Educational Strategies: To Serve Rural Children and Youth, is in process of final revision.

budgets." Despite the important technical advances in this type of educational planning in recent years, its perspective is far too narrow and its methodologies too closely tied to the particular features of formal education to have more than limited utility for meeting the educational planning needs of rural development.

The new type of planning required for this purpose must encompass a much wider range and variety of educational objectives, clienteles, and activities; it must be much more decentralized and flexible in order to adapt to important local differences in learning needs and to integrate educational activities with related development goals and activities; and it must give much greater attention than in the past to the poorest subgroups in rural populations who have been largely bypassed by formal education and by the whole development process.

Obviously this is far too large and complex a matter to be dealt with adequately in a single paper. What follows, therefore, is limited to a few selected observations that seem especially timely and relevant to the IIEP/SIDA seminar. The following basic questions (which I do not propose to answer in full) provide a useful framework for these comments.

1. What is meant by rural development and how should education be perceived in this context?

2. What are the essential learning needs of rural populations?

3. How adequately, and by what different means, are these learning needs currently being served?

4. What are some of the more promising and feasible ways of responding to these learning needs adequately?

5. What are the implications of all of the foregoing for the planning of rural education?

It is well to remind ourselves at the outset that rural people represent upwards of 80 percent of the total population of most lower income nations, and that over the next 20 years, notwithstanding the strong urban migration, their absolute numbers will continue to increase rapidly. As many as half or more of these rural people (depending on the country and particular area) are imprisoned in absolute poverty, struggling simply to survive. Of today's rural children 90 percent or more will live out their lives in the countryside, and, despite the rosier impression conveyed by national school participation statistics, in many rural areas fewer than 10 percent of the children actually obtain a full primary schooling, making them members of an elite and prime candidates for migration to cities.

Viewed against these hard realities, the perennial advocacy of universal schooling and of equalizing the educational offerings and opportunities for urban and rural children (not to mention adults) strikes a chord of unreality.

A similar sense of unreality surrounds the opposite advocacy of "deschooling" these rural societies in the name of banishing inequality and exploitation, and of substituting for conventional schooling a new style of liberating education that would give birth to aggressive demands for social and political change. Whatever its appeal, this strategy would require a cadre of extraordinary teachers beyond the reach even of the richest nations. These opposing advocacies, and many others in between, provide unlimited room for philosophical and ideological disputation. But for better or worse the schools (and the constraints on urther expansion and transformation) are among the important realities of the landscape of developing nations, and are likely to remain so for a long time to come, even under revolutionary circumstances.

The Meaning of Rural Development and Education

To talk sense about planning education for rural populations and rural development one must start with a realistic and coherent vision of rural development and a perception of education that fits it.

Until recently, most economic planners and agricultural authorities loosely equated rural development with increased agricultural production (particularly the production of major commercial and export crops that improved the statistics of GNP and foreign trade balances). Today, however, this concept is seen as clearly too narrow and superficial to accord with the realities. The view adopted here is that

rural development is a much more complex and long-term process, involving a fundamental transformation of rural societies--socially, economically, and politically.

A corollary to this broader view is that the prime motive power for rural development must come primarily from the rural people themselves. For this to happen, they must acquire new insights and perceptions of themselves and the world around them, new attitudes and new hope in the future, and many kinds of new knowledge and skill s useful to realizing these hopes. This kind of transformation is essentially what education for rural development is all about, and this is how it must be broadly viewed by educational planners. In contrast to the conventional notion that equates education with schooling, this larger view equates education with learning and envisages learning as a lifelong process involving a great variety of experiences and institutional arrangements.

To shift from the narrow institutionalized view of education to this broad functional view requires a mental leap that is extremely difficult for anyone whose habits of thought have been confined and deeply grooved by long association with formal education. One striking evidence of this intellectual difficulty is the compulsion of many educators and students of educational planning to conceive of "basic education" and nonformal education very narrowly in terms of the limited objectives and content of the standard

school curriculum, and as something applying mainly to school-age children and youth (except for adult literacy).

The Learning Needs of Rural Populations

In the real world the basic learning needs of rural children and adults are far more numerous and diverse than those that formal schools were ever designed to serve, for these learning needs are tied to the total spectrum of human needs, activities, and opportunities.

The most fundamental needs are associated with sheer survival--the knowledge and skills, for example, to secure sufficient food, drink, and shelter to sustain life, and to protect one's self and family against hostile elements; the ability to communicate and cooperate within one's own social group; and a set of shared values, beliefs, and types of behavior compatible with sustaining the integrity and continuity of the society.

These survival needs are of dominant concern to the one-third to one-half of all rural families eking out an existence in absolute poverty. Their dream, when they dare to dream, is to lift their heads even slightly above the survival level where they can afford to start dreaming bigger dreams and to have at least a fighting chance of realizing them. Until then, their view of life remains fatalistic, and ideas of putting their children through school or of becoming literate themselves are likely to seem remote and irrelevant.

With encouragement, however, they may become eager

candidates for learning how to improve their food supply and nutrition; how to guard the health and safety of their children against common diseases and other hazards; how to improve their shelter and clothing; how to acquire occupational skills to improve their employment possibilities; and how to brighten their lives through expanded social and recreational activities and the fuller enjoyment of their inherited culture. They may also become interested in learning how to exert greater command over their own destiny and how to reshape their social, economic, and political environment so as to open opportunities for a more secure and satisfying life.

Rural families already above the absolute poverty level--with greater assets and self-confidence and a belief that upward mobility is possible, at least for their children--have a more advanced set of perceived learning needs and a generally stronger inclination to take advantage of available learning opportunities. They are usually more anxious than their poorer neighbors--and more able economically--to send their children to school, in the hope that at least one of them will climb the academic ladder far enough to acquire regular employment in the city's modern sector. These relatively better-off rural people are also quickest to take advantage of nonformal education opportunities, agricultural extension services, health and family planning services, new skill training programs, literacy courses, and the like.

Just as the learning needs of rural people vary greatly according to their socio-economic circumstances, they vary also according to family, community, and occupational roles, and according to the ecology and the development level of the particular geographic area. Although it is useful and legitimate for general analytical and planning purposes to classify different population subgroups and their various learning needs by broad categories (for example, the "minimum essential learning needs" of rural children and youth sketched in New Paths to Learning[2]), in specific situations these needs vary considerably in detail. For example, though farmers generally need to learn about improved production technologies as they become available, what rice farmers need to learn differs from what wheat or fruit farmers need to learn, and what the small subsistence farmer requires is often very different from the needs of large commercial farmers. Similar, if perhaps less obvious, differences exist in other fields such as health, nutrition, family planning, and occupational skill training.

Thus, in sharp contrast to the assumption of homogeneity of learning needs that underlies standardized syllabuses,

---

[2]Philip H. Coombs, New Paths to Learning for Rural Children and Youth (New York: International Council for Educational Development, 1973), pp. 14-15.

textbooks, and time schedules in formal education systems, great care must be taken in shaping the content of nonformal education programs to allow for the heterogeneity of learning needs. Emphasis needs to be given to generating relevant and timely local-specific educational content and materials. The mass media, though they have a large and greatly under-utilized potential for serving rural learning needs, have serious limitations in this respect. In particular, care should be taken not to oversell communications satellites as a panacea for meeting rural learning needs.

It is important also to recognize that rural learning needs are not fixed--again in contrast to the implicit assumption underlying school curriculums. Once a rural area becomes dynamic, the learning needs--and the interest in learning new things, such as new types of occupational skills--proliferate rapidly. In such circumstances, literacy programs become more relevant and have a better chance of success because the written word becomes increasingly functional and indispensable in the daily life of the evolving local economy and society, and more and more functional roles require a working mastery of literacy.

Even in less dynamic situations the content of educational programs has to keep one jump ahead of the moving frontiers of people's knowledge. An agricultural extension service that conveys the same message again and again like a broken record will soon lose its audience; if the message was good, many farmers will have already applied it and will be anxious

to get on to the next step. Family planning and nutrition programs that repeatedly harp on the same theme soon bore their listeners. As a general rule, the more relevant and successful rural education programs are in satisfying the needs of their clients, the faster they have to work to keep up with the heightened interests and learning demands of their clients.

Existing Means for Serving Rural Learning Needs

ICED's case studies and other evidence all confirm that there is an enormous and widening gap between the extensive learning needs of rural populations and the existing means for serving them. For convenience of exposition we shall discuss these means under three general headings: informal, formal, and nonformal education--though there are hybrids that cut across these categories.

Informal education--learning in unstructured fashion from one's daily experiences and exposure to one's socio-economic environment--is by all odds the largest and most important means of meeting the learning needs of rural people. Yet paradoxically informal education has been the least examined means and least appreciated by educational experts. This "natural" mode of learning is truly universal, but in substance differs enormously according to differences in local "learning environments." In "traditional" societies undisturbed by forces of modernization (of which few remain in the world), informal education is the principal means by which the

accumulated corpus of wisdom, beliefs, and practices of the particular society, clan, or tribe are passed on to each new generation. But as new ideas, techniques, and understandings invade the society and gain acceptance, they become incorporated into the local learning environment and are spread through informal education.

Thus, in the past 25 years informal education has undoubtedly been a larger disseminator and promoter of innovations in previously tradition-bound societies than all types of organized education programs combined. The learning environments of rural areas, though still heavily laden with traditional lore, have been considerably altered by the mass media, by visitors from and to the more modern world outside, by the penetration of new products, services, and technologies, and most importantly, by the very notions of innovation, change, and progress. The "modern" schools are another of the many forces that have been modifying village "learning environments."

But informal education has also been a major bulwark against change in rural areas. It has frequently been a means for resisting the intrusion of seemingly hostile ideas, techniques, and practices that appeared--especially in the eyes of local "gatekeepers"--to jeopardize the integrity or structure of the society. Then there is the different kind of phenomenon where new and valuable information, technologies, and services reaching a rural area from the rapidly modernizing urban oasis have become monopolized by strong local groups or individuals to their own advantage, exacerbating existing social and economic distortions and inequities in the community.

Not long ago, only academic anthropologists and rural sociologists were interested in these matters; educational experts, if they recognized the crucial and dominant role of informal education in rural societies, quickly dismissed it as something that could not be planned and that had little relevance to formal education. By now it has become clear that informal education cannot be dismissed or ignored, that it must be taken seriously into account by rural education planners.

Turning now to formal education, we hardly need to review here the well-known and much criticized shortcomings--both quantitative and qualitative--of rural primary and secondary schools, or the economic and other constraints that will inhibit their further expansion and their future improvement. These shortcomings, however, should not be allowed to obscure the commendable efforts that poorer countries have made to bring new educational opportunities to rural children and youth, nor the positive benefits they have generated (which in sum are probably considerably greater than their severest critics admit). The undeniable fact remains, however, that these benefits have gone mainly to a small minority and that the school system has turned out to be far less an instrument of democratic equalization than a potent tool of heightened social and economic inequality. (It is unwise, however, to accept popular and unexamined stereotypes uncritically; we still know far too little about the school's actual influence on the

many youngsters who drop out early, and about the positive and negative side effects that village schools have had and are likely to have on the community at large.)

Whatever the contributions of rural schools, they have fallen drastically short of earlier goals and expectations. Moreover, even with massive expansion and reform, they could meet only a fractional part of the truly basic learning needs of rural populations. The sooner this reality is recognized and generally accepted, the sooner the debate over school policy and reform and the future potentialities of the schools can be cleansed of emotional rhetoric and placed on rational grounds.

Finally, a few observations about nonformal education, and here it is important to distinguish between the relatively newer types and the older indigenous types of nonformal education in developing countries.

Over the past 20 years, a great number and variety of nonformal educational programs--defined here as organized and purposive educational activities outside the structure of the formal school system--have been implanted throughout the developing world, usually with outside assistance and often bearing a strong external stamp. They include a vast assortment of clienteles, methods, objectives, and subject matter stretching across literacy, agriculture, various kinds of occupational training, health and nutrition, school equivalency, family planning, home economics, administration and management, and numerous other fields.

The available evidence suggests that, taken as a whole, these activities have served useful purposes, though they have varied greatly in their general efficacy and impact and, like formal schools, have frequently fallen far short of initial hopes and expectations. The great majority have been far too small and served far too few people to exert a far-reaching impact, even when, judged by other criteria, they were quite successful. But no few of them, including some that were heavily financed, were ill-conceived at the outset and proved to be as inefficient and ill-fitting as the schools are so often accused of being.

What is most significant about these programs is that, collectively, they have demonstrated the sizable potentialities of nonformal education, and they have yielded a large crop of important practical lessons--both positive and negative-- on how to go about, and how not to go about, exploiting these potentialities.

The other category of nonformal education activities mentioned above--the older indigenous ones--exists on a sizable scale in most developing countries. These activities, like newer programs, take many forms and cover a wide range of subjects, and many have major social roles. Systems of religious instruction, for example, sometimes produce more local literates than the official schools. The indigenous medical specialists and midwives who operate local health

systems are often important teachers of disease prevention, child and maternal care, first aid and other subjects relating to health. These activities also play a much larger and more important role in the economies of developing countries than is generally appreciated by either economists or educators. Among the most important of the nonformal learning systems, economically, are the diverse apprenticeship systems covering a variety of occupations, including some that involve new and sophisticated products and technologies (e.g., repair of motor vehicles, electronic equipment, and power boats, and the manufacture of diesel pumps). There can be little question that their "graduates" are contributing far more to the day-to-day functioning and growth of economies--and at far lower cost and wastage--than are the sum total of graduates of modern vocational and technical schools.

In summary, all three of the modes of education reviewed above have made significant contributions, but they are grossly inadequate in their present state to serve the essential educational requirements of rural populations and rural development. Yet they constitute important foundations to build on. The question is how to go about building.

Promising Possibilities for the Future

There are innumerable and economically feasible technical possibilities for reducing the rural education gap through combinations of all three modes of education discussed above. But technically sound solutions are not enough; to translate them successfully into action requires astute diagnosis and planning, the strong support of political and educational

leaders and of the people themselves, and not least of all, the overcoming of many stubborn logistical and bureaucratic obstacles. A further requirement is that many of these educational actions must be closely knitted to related development actions, becoming integral components of various development subsystems. And the most fundamental requisite for their success is that there be a strong and coherent national strategy of rural development cutting across all sectors and embracing a rural educational strategy as an integral part. Admittedly these are extremely difficult conditions to satisfy, but they need to be candidly recognized in order to avoid illusions, miscalculations, and false hopes that can do more harm than good.

All new educational initiatives need not be suspended until all these conditions are met. These requisites should be seen as indicating the long-term directions in which to move when formulating short-term actions. And there are abundant opportunities, in every country, for taking important next steps.

Having thus circumscribed my optimism, I should like to suggest a few illustrative areas of opportunity and lines of approach that offer promise and merit early attention by developing countries and external assistance agencies.

1. Reorientation and transformation of the schools. Despite their admitted shortcomings, it would be naive to write off the schools as a lost cause. They are there, they represent a large investment, and no matter what critics may say they are likely to remain there and keep on consuming major resources. The real question is whether and how they can be reoriented and reshaped into a stronger and more positive force for rural development. Given enough determination and time, there is a good possibility that they can be, though it will be more difficult and take longer in some countries than in others to abandon the once-fetching strategy of linear expansion that has dominated the educational scene for so long.

Each country--even each community--will have to work out its own best solutions, but there are several guiding principles that might be useful to all. The first is that if the schools are to become major participants in, and promoters of, rural development, their overriding objective must be to prepare the great majority of children and youth--those who will remain in the countryside--to make the most of their limited opportunities. This need not preclude them from also preparing a minority of especially able and motivated young people for moving on to higher levels of the formal education systems.

The second principle is to cut the Gordian knot that ties age to grade and grade to subject, and to abandon the notion that learners must attend school full time on a fixed academic calendar in order to acquire an education, which is demonstrably

an invalid premise. To serve the prime purpose indicated above, schools must adapt themselves to the convenience and exigencies of the pupils, their families, and the community, not the opposite way around. School schedules should be flexibly adapted, for example, to the agricultural cycle and to the imperative home duties of young people; failure to do so has been an important cause of early dropouts. Older children and youths who missed schooling earlier or dropped out prematurely should have easy access to a "second chance." (The limited evidence available to ICED suggests that these older students, having gained greater maturity and motivation, are likely to learn much faster and with greater retention, on a part-time basis, than the conventional school calendar provides for.)

The third principle is that the schools should continue to concentrate on general education (the function they do best) and not attempt to provide occupational skill training (the function they perform poorly). This does not mean that schools should cling to the old curriculum and textbooks and methods. A revised general education program should, among other things, emphasize orientation toward work and toward the local environment, and it should use the local community and economy as learning resources (just as informal education has done all along) and thereby integrate education with the real life of the learners, rather than alienating them from their environment.

The practical difficulties in transforming the schools along these lines are, of course, many. Some will point out that such changes would result in an inequitable and politically unacceptable "dual system." The reply to that objection is that such a dual system already exists--in fact, if not in form--and it is working powerfully against the welfare of the great majority who remain in the countryside and against rural development as a whole. Others will protest that these changes would handicap the brightest in achieving access to postprimary schooling. But this is not unavoidable. Moreover, it is difficult to believe a school system that benefits mainly the brightest and the well-born at tremendous penalty to the great majority can long endure in today's circumstances. Still others will worry about the "erosion of standards"--but what standards and whose standards? What are the standards for preparing those rural young people who are condemned to live in the countryside to live a more decent and satisfying life in these admittedly limited circumstances, and to do their part toward improving the conditions of the countryside--for the benefit of themselves and others?

Changing the primary schools alone, of course, will not suffice. Upper echelons of the formal system are equally in need of major overhaul, and perhaps this must take precedence--or at least go on simultaneously--since it is the higher echelons

that dominate the orientation of the lower schools and keep them from changing. Why should there not be rural-oriented universities that give bright and motivated rural youngsters equal opportunity with urban ones to develop administrative, professional, and semiprofessional careers in rural services? And why not have educational institutions that address their social science, biological, and other research to solving the massive problems of rural people?

2. Strengthening indigenous learning systems. One of the questions most urgently in need of research is how indigenous learning systems could be helped to do a broader and better job without destroying or corrupting their basic character. One possibility, for example, might be for highly institutionalized vocational training schools, whose high costs and dubious results raise serious questions about their viability and justification, to turn their attention to helping upgrade and broaden various indigenous training systems by working part time with both the master craftsmen and their apprentices.

3. Building educational components into local development projects. Most major development projects are designed by engineers, agriculturalists, construction experts, or other specialists who are prone to focus their attention mainly on the physical components and tend to neglect the essential human components required for the project's full success. Conversely, most educational projects are designed by educational and training

specialists who focus on education and training, seen as a separate activity, and fail to give adequate attention to how the education and training results will be used.

The World Bank, for one, is now giving more attention to the inclusion of proper educational components in major agricultural and rural development schemes, and the ILO and FAO have increased their concern for ensuring that the training schemes they assist become effectively tied in with neighboring development projects. All would agree that much remains to be learned about integrating the human learning components with the physical components of development projects. Paradoxically, those who are pioneering on this important frontier seem to be getting little help from the professional experts in educational planning.

4. Tying related educational programs together. If formal education is too monolithic, nonformal education suffers from just the opposite ailment--severe fragmentation. This reflects the natural compulsion of each group with a special interest and responsibility to run its own show. Some developing countries, for example, have as many as six or more different agricultural extension programs, specializing in different commodities, and often they are unaffiliated with what should be closely related agricultural credit or marketing schemes.

The whole field of family life improvement is especially marked by fragmentation, with separate programs of health, sanitation, nutrition, family planning, home economics, maternal and child care, and so forth--all independently seeking to reach and influence the same families in the same communities. Apart from the enormous waste involved in the duplication of delivery systems, these narrow, single-purpose approaches are very confusing to their common clients, who are not accustomed to viewing their lives as divided into so many specialized pieces.

A more coherent and cooperative approach, founded on a broader and more unified vision of what is required to improve the overall quality of rural family life, could unquestionably produce substantially better results with the resources already being spent. The family life improvement program in Kenya, assisted by the FAO, points to the possibilities.

Clearly the first requirement for this more integrated approach--in this particular field and in others--is to overcome some sticky bureaucratic obstacles. The further requirement is skillful diagnosis of the possibilities in each situation and imaginative planning to take advantage of these possibilities, followed of course by effective implementation.

5. Tapping unused resources. There exists in virtually every developing country an impressive array of resources that could be used more fully to meet important rural learning needs. Examples include the broadcasting systems (often devoted largely

to sheer entertainment); the information bureaus of ministries (often preoccupied with press releases and other forms of publicity and promotion); underutilized school facilities and teachers; newspapers and periodicals; and creative talent in the private sector that could be mobilized to generate more effective educational software.

Beyond these more obvious examples, there are in rural areas many local resources with a significant educational potential: for example, competent craftsmen and farmers who could help train others; able students and other literate people who could teach others; midwives and other local "specialists" who, with appropriate training, could spearhead various improvements and innovations; innumerable opportunities for on-the-job training in agriculture and other enterprises; local markets and other congregating points where exhibitions, film showings, and the like could convey useful knowledge; and indigenous forms of entertainment and communication, such as puppet shows and ballad singing, which in some places are already being used to bring new ideas and information to rural people.

The problem, of course, is to mobilize and organize these resources and to plan their use in relation to major learning needs. This is seldom easy, but it has been done in a variety of places. Tanzanian newspapers now carry regular educational pages for new literates, and new regional papers are being created for the express purpose of bringing fresh ideas and useful knowledge to rural people. Thailand is using its school facilities and teachers on an impressive scale to provide

teenagers and young adults with "second chance" educational programs. The ACPO program in Colombia is using a radio network, a newspaper, a variety of small bulletins and texts, and unpaid local volunteers to serve a wide variety of basic learning needs of thousands of poor campesinos throughout the country. In Indonesia new local skill training programs, closely tied to the local economy, are springing up and are making use of local craftsmen and farms to prepare young people to start enterprises of their own.

The foregoing has been merely a rough sketch of some of the possibilities of meeting rural learning needs more adequately; these and other possibilities urgently require closer investigation.

Implications for Educational Planning

It should be obvious from the previous pages of this paper that the author sees great new challenges and changes in store for educational planning. Whether and how these challenges will be met, and who will take the lead in broadening and reorienting the perspectives, concepts and methodologies of educational planning to match these challenges remain to be seen. By way of summarizing some of the implications, I submit the following propositions:

1. Educational planning cannot remain the exclusive preserve of formal education and ministries of education; virtually all ministries and other operating organisations (voluntary as well as official) must become involved in educational planning.

2. Though the need will remain for broad national level planning, more and more educational planning must be decentralized to subnational levels closer to the scene of action.

3. Educational planning at all levels, but especially the lower ones, must be melded with development planning, including particularly the planning of individual development schemes in specific areas to ensure that such schemes contain adequate and appropriate learning components and serve as major training grounds. For these purposes, educational planners frequently will have to become members of mixed planning teams, abandoning their isolation and subordinating their specialized perceptions to a wider perspective of integrated development planning that transcends individual sectors. They must also stop thinking of education as a separate sector. Educational planners will be obliged to play a more creative and innovative role, both as designers of new "models" to fit particular needs and circumstances and as engineers for adapting existing models to changing needs and conditions.

4. Educational planning, while continuing to pay close attention to quantitative data and to costs and other economic aspects of educational activities, will have

to give much closer attention than previously to the sociological, cultural, political, and organizational aspects of education which often do not lend themselves to statistical expression.

5. As educational planning moves downward and outward, becoming more intimately tied to actual operations and problems of implementation and extending over a much wider range of activities, many people who are not full-fledged professional planners will have to assume important planning functions as part of their overall work. This development will create important training requirements for which no ample provisions yet exist.

One could elaborate these propositions at length and add additional ones. But perhaps the central point germane to the IIEP/SIDA seminar has been sufficiently emphasized --namely, that the IIEP and all other international, regional, and national organizations concerned with educational planning, should not lack for interesting and important endeavors for many years to come.